

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1, 3-5, 18-20, 23-26, 45, 49, 50, and 61-66 are pending. Claims 2, 6-17, 21-22, 46-48, and 51-60 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 61-66 are newly added. Claims 1, 18, and 45 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 18, and 45.

**Claim Amendments**

Independent claims 1, 18, and 45 are amended for purposes of clarification. Pending dependent claims are amended for purposes of consistency with the amended independent claims. No new matter is added by way of these amendments, as support may be found, for example, at least on pages 3-5 and Figures 3, 5, and 6 of the Specification as filed.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Examiner's answer dated May 14, 2010, the Examiner issues new grounds for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, claims 53-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 53-60 are canceled by this submission; thus, this rejection is now moot.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 45-49, 52-57 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0119736 ("Chen"). Claims 46-48, 52-57, and 60 are canceled; thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to the canceled claims. With respect to the pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed to an event notification system for a cluster network. Specifically, in the claimed invention, a web page is loaded into the administrator's browser that displays the status of the cluster for monitoring by a cluster administrator. The web page registers a list of events with the event monitor running in the browser. *See* Specification, pages 3-5 and Figure 3. The event monitor periodically queries the event buffer for events. When something of interest happens on the cluster, *e.g.*, an event occurs such as a service failing, an event is sent to all nodes of the cluster via the event forwarding mechanism on each node. The event buffer receives the event and adds the event to a log file that the event buffer keeps and periodically prunes. The event monitor receives the file of recent events from the event buffer. It detects the new event and compares the event against the list of relevant events registered by the web page. When the new event is found on the list, the event monitor directs the browser to refresh the page. The page is reloaded from the web server, obtaining the status, and is displayed to the administrator.

Accordingly, independent claim 45 is amended by this submission to recite, in part, (i) forwarding an event generated in response to the detected change to each of the one or more components; (ii) accessing an event buffer, wherein the event buffer comprises a subscriber configured to listen for events and is configured to maintain a log file of received events that are received within a specified period of time; (iii) determining whether the log file comprises the

generated event that require the web page to be refreshed by comparing the generated event corresponding to the detected change to a list of events relevant to the web page currently displayed in the web browser; and (iv) refreshing the web page when the generated event corresponding to the detected change is found on the list of events.

Turning to the rejection, “[a] claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). Further, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants assert that Chen fails to disclose each and every element of the claims.

Specifically, Chen is directed to displaying events of a plurality of network devices. However, Chen fails to disclose a cluster environment. That is, in Chen, the system involves an administrative workstation, a plurality of network devices, and a connection connecting the administrative workstation and the network devices. *See* Chen, paragraph [0009]. The system of Chen can remotely monitor the networking devices via the administrative workstation and display relevant information thereon in real time. However, because there is no cluster environment, there is not a plurality of nodes that each comprise an event forwarding mechanism to forward an event to other nodes of the cluster. In fact, Chen does not even mention any type of forwarding mechanism for forwarding events, because there is no need for a forwarding mechanism in the system set up of Chen. Rather, Chen discloses that after detecting an event, event register information is obtained by accessing event registers, and determining whether the event needs displaying. *See* Chen, paragraph [0010]. Because the information is already stored in event registers, there is no need for any

forwarding mechanism. Accordingly, Chen fails to disclose or render obvious (i), as required above.

In addition, in Chen, everything with respect to events, including generating of event information, is done via event registers. *See* Chen, paragraph [0022]. Even assuming *arguendo* that the event registers are equated to the log file of the claimed invention, the event registers are not configured to store received events *for a specified period of time*. In fact, Chen is silent with respect to a specified period of time for which events are stored in the event registers. Further, the event registers of Chen are not maintained by an event buffer comprising a subscriber configured to listen for events, as is the log file of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Chen fails to disclose or render obvious (ii), as required above.

Further, Chen fails to disclose registering events that are relevant to a particular web page displaying status information of the cluster. While Chen discloses registration of events, this registration of events is not tied to the web page displayed on the browser of Chen. Rather, in Chen, the registration of events is directed to registration of network devices in an event register. For example, paragraph [0022] and Figure 2 describes that when a network device is initialized by an administrator, the event managing module 66 registers events in the event register 64 for the software modules 60 and the hardware modules 62, and generates event register information for each event. Clearly, the registration of events is not tied to a web page that needs refreshing in Chen, as required by the claimed invention.

It logically follows from the above that Chen fails to disclose or render obvious (iii) as required above, because Chen's registration of events is different from the type of registration of web page relevant events that is claimed. Further, Chen fails to disclose or render obvious

comparing a generated event corresponding to the detected change in the cluster to *a list of events relevant to the web page* currently displayed in the web browser and registered with the administrator event monitor, as required by (iii) above.

Chen also fails to disclose (iv), because there is no web page that is refreshed based on the outcome that the generated event matches one of the registered events relevant to the web page and which requires the web page to be refreshed.

In view of the above, it is clear that the Examiner's contentions fail to support an anticipation rejection of amended claim 45. Pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

#### *Claims 1, 2, 6-7, 11-13, 17-20, 22-23 and 25*

Claims 1, 2, 6-7, 11-13, 17-20, 22-23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,748,884 ("Royce") in view of Chen. Claims 2, 6-7, 11-13, 17, and 22 are canceled; thus, this rejection is moot with respect to claims 2, 6-7, 11-13, 17, and 22. For the pending claims, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 18 are amended to recite subject matter similar to that in amended independent claim 45, discussed above. Therefore, amended independent claims 1 and 18 require the limitations recited in (i) – (iv) above. However, Royce fails to disclose or render obvious the aforementioned limitations required by independent claims 1 and 18.

Specifically, Royce is directed to an auto-notification system for notifying recipients of detected events in a network. In Royce, pre-determined notification procedures are performed

based on messages detected in trap programs. While Royce teaches detecting an event (a message) and sending a notice based on the detected event, Royce fails to disclose or render obvious refreshing a web page with status information of a cluster network by comparing a registered list of events to a detected event. In fact, Royce is not related to monitoring a cluster network by updating status information displayed on a web page; instead, Royce is focused on auto-notification. Further, Royce fails to disclose or render obvious maintaining a log file of detected events for a specified period of time. Thus, Royce also fails to disclose or render obvious limitations (i) – (iv), as recited above.

Further, because the limitations discussed above with respect to claim 45 are also amended into the independent claims 1 and 18, the arguments made above with respect to Chen also apply to the other independent claims. Accordingly, Chen fails to supply that which Royce lacks, because Chen also fails to disclose or render obvious (i) – (iv) as required above.

In view of the above, it is clear that the Examiner's contentions fail to support an obviousness rejection of amended independent claims 1 and 18. Pending dependent claims are patentable over Royce and Chen for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5, 8-10 and 21

Claims 3-5, 8-10 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce in view of Chen, and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0037136 ("Labovitz"). Claims 8-10 and 21 are canceled; thus, this rejection is moot with respect to claims 8-10 and 21.

As described above, amended independent claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Royce in view of Chen, because neither Royce nor Chen disclose or render obvious all the limitations of the

amended independent claims. Further, Labovitz fails to supply that which Royce and Chen lack. Labovitz merely discloses pruning of a database to reduce the size of the file. *See* Labovitz, paragraph [0127]. However, Labovitz is silent with respect to limitations (i) – (iv), as required by the amended independent claims. In view of the above, it is clear that the amended independent claims are patentable over Royce, Chen, and Labovitz, whether considered alone or in combination. Dependent claims 3-5 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 14-16 and 26

Claims 14-16 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce in view of Chen, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,823,359 (“Heidingsfeld”). Claims 14-16 are canceled; thus, this rejection is moot with respect to claims 14-16.

As described above, amended independent claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Royce in view of Chen, because neither Royce nor Chen disclose or render obvious all the limitations of the amended independent claims. Further, Heidingsfeld fails to supply that which Royce and Chen lack. Heidingsfeld merely discloses a display as a stand-alone application. *See* Heidingsfeld, col. 5, ll. 37-43. However, Heidingsfeld is silent with respect to limitations (i) – (iv), as required by the amended independent claims. In view of the above, it is clear that the amended independent claims are patentable over Royce, Chen, and Heidingsfeld, whether considered alone or in combination. Dependent claim 26 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 24

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce in view of Chen, and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0111507 (“Villado”).

As described above, amended independent claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Royce in view of Chen, because neither Royce nor Chen disclose or render obvious all the limitations of the amended independent claims. Further, Villado fails to supply that which Royce and Chen lack. Villado merely discloses remote monitoring via a JAVA applet. *See* Villado, paragraph [0063]. However, Villado is silent with respect to limitations (i) – (iv), as required by the amended independent claims. In view of the above, it is clear that the amended independent claims are patentable over Royce, Chen, and Villado, whether considered alone or in combination. Dependent claim 24 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 50-51 and 58-59

Claims 50-51 and 58-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Heidingsfeld. Claims 51 and 58-59 are canceled; thus, this rejection is moot with respect to claims 51 and 58-59.

As described above, amended independent claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Chen, and Heidingsfeld because neither Chen nor Heidingsfeld disclose or render obvious limitations (i) – (iv) recited above, as required by the amended independent claims. Dependent claim 50 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.



### **New Claims**

Claims 61-66 are newly added. No new matter is added by way of the new dependent claims, as support may be found, for example, in the originally filed claims and at least on page 4 and 14 of the Specification. Applicants assert that new dependent claims 61-66 depend from amended independent claim 1, and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1. Accordingly, favorable consideration of the new claims is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant believes this submission is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 33227/448001).

Dated: July 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/  
Robert P. Lord  
Registration No.: 46,479  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
*Attorney for Applicant*